

Exhibit 8

March 23, 2015

Scott B. Wilkens
Tel 202 639-6072
Fax 202 661-4832
swilkens@jenner.com

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL
AND FIRST CLASS MAIL**

David H. Kramer, Esq.
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto CA 94304

Re: Google v. Hood Subpoena

Dear David:

We represent Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc. (FOX) in this matter and write with respect to the subpoena that Plaintiff Google, Inc. served on FOX on March 13, 2015. The subpoena is premature under the District Court's March 2, 2015 Order ("Order"), because it was served prior to the commencement of discovery. The Order makes clear that that discovery shall not commence until after the District Court issues "a detailed written ruling on the issuance of the injunction" (Order at 3) and after Attorney General Hood has filed his Answer (Order at 4), neither of which has occurred. Accordingly, FOX will deem the March 13 Subpoena to have been served on the date upon which discovery in this case begins, *i.e.*, the date when Attorney General Hood files an Answer.

Please advise us promptly if your understanding is contrary in any respect to this approach.

Sincerely,


Scott B. Wilkens

SBW:nly